



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/759,031	01/12/2001	Keith Yeats	AC02758US	2192
75	590 12/27/2002			
Joan M. McGillycuddy Akzo Nobel Inc. Intellectual Property Department 7 Livingstone Avenue			EXAMINER	
			MOORE, MARGARET G	
_	Y 10522-3408		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			1712	
			DATE MAIL ED: 12/27/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			<i>/</i> T~/
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/759,031	YEATS ET AL.	
-	Examiner	Art Unit	-
	Margaret G. Moore	1712	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	ars on the cover she t with the c	correspondenc add	ress
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper rep ch places the applic	cation in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advi event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later that ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 1706.07(f).	sory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI	the final rejection. EFINAL REJECTION. S	See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate ext the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) $oxed{\boxtimes}$ they raise new issues that would require furthe	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);	
(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ns.
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed	d amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NC	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: none.			
Claim(s) objected to: none.			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 to 8, 11 and 12</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			·
8. $\square$ The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	proved by the Exam	niner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·	
10. Other:		Margaret G. Moore Primary Examiner	Moc
		Art (U)Nit: 1712	

Continuation Sh et (PTO-303) 09/759,031



Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The amendment raises new issues that would require further consideration as it introduces a limitation not previously considered. In addition, it requires more than a cursory review to determine patentability.